

Officer History

Officer Name: KEEGAN, SEAN

Tax ID: 954994

Sex: M

Shield: 12338

Race: White

Rank: PO

Command: 075

Birth Year: [REDACTED]

Appt Date: 07/09/2013

Age: [REDACTED]

Tenure: 8

CCRB #	CMD	Incident Date	Reported Date	Allegation	Allegation Disposition	Board Discipline Recommendation*	NYPD Allegation Disposition	NYPD MOS Penalty
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]			
201409458	165	09/06/2014	09/13/2014	Abuse - Premises entered and/or searched	Unsubstantiated			
				[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]			
201502719	165	04/09/2015	04/10/2015	OMN - Failure to prepare a memo book entry	OMN			
				[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]			
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]			
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]			
				[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]			
201708175	075	09/27/2017	10/04/2017	Force - Physical force	Substantiated (Charges)		APU Guilty	Forfeit vacation 18 days
				Abuse - Stop	Substantiated (Charges)		APU Guilty	Forfeit vacation 18 days
				Force - Physical force	Unsubstantiated			
				OMN - Failure to produce stop and frisk report	OMN			
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]			
201903280	075	04/06/2019	04/16/2019	Abuse - Stop	Unsubstantiated			
				OMN - Failure to prepare a memo book entry	OMN			
201906398	075	07/20/2019	07/22/2019	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]			
				[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]			
				[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]			
				[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]			
				Abuse - Frisk	Unsubstantiated			
				Force - Physical force	Unsubstantiated			
				[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]			

*Board Discipline Recommendations were not issued for complaints closed prior to the CCRB's adoption of the NYPD's Disciplinary Matrix on 03/15/2021. With the adoption of the NYPD Disciplinary Matrix, CCRB now issues a Board Discipline Recommendation for officers that is separate and apart from the disposition of the allegations substantiated against the officer.

Officer History

Officer Name: KEEGAN, SEAN

Tax ID: 954994

Sex: M

Shield: 12338

Race: White

Rank: PO

Command: 075

Birth Year: [REDACTED]

Appt Date: 07/09/2013

Age: [REDACTED]

Tenure: 8

CCRB #	CMD	Incident Date	Reported Date	Allegation	Allegation Disposition	Board Discipline Recommendation*	NYPD Allegation Disposition	NYPD MOS Penalty
201906398	075	07/20/2019	07/22/2019	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]			
				[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]			
				[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]			
				Discourtesy - Word	Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Command Discipline - A	Command Discipline - A
				[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]			
201906894	075	07/31/2019	08/04/2019	Discourtesy - Word	Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Substantiated (Charges)		
				[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]			
				Discourtesy - Word	Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Substantiated (Charges)		
				[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]			
				Force - Physical force	Unsubstantiated			
				Force - Physical force	Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Substantiated (Charges)		
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]			
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]			
202001583	075	02/25/2020	02/26/2020	OPMN - Failure to prepare a memo book entry				
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]			
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]			
202007357	075	10/17/2020	11/06/2020	OPMN - Failure to produce stop and frisk report				
				OPMN - Failure to prepare a memo book entry				
				Abuse - Failure to provide RTKA card				

*Board Discipline Recommendations were not issued for complaints closed prior to the CCRB's adoption of the NYPD's Disciplinary Matrix on 03/15/2021. With the adoption of the NYPD Disciplinary Matrix, CCRB now issues a Board Discipline Recommendation for officers that is separate and apart from the disposition of the allegations substantiated against the officer.

Officer History

Officer Name: KEEGAN, SEAN

Tax ID: 954994

Sex: M

Shield: 12338

Race: White

Rank: PO

Command: 075

Birth Year: [REDACTED]

Appt Date: 07/09/2013

Age: [REDACTED]

Tenure: 8

CCRB #	CMD	Incident Date	Reported Date	Allegation	Allegation Disposition	Board Discipline Recommendation*	NYPD Allegation Disposition	NYPD MOS Penalty
202007357	075	10/17/2020	11/06/2020	Abuse - Refusal to provide shield number OPMN - Improper use of body-worn camera Abuse - Stop Abuse - Question				
				Total Charges = 45	Total Cases = 15			

*Board Discipline Recommendations were not issued for complaints closed prior to the CCRB's adoption of the NYPD's Disciplinary Matrix on 03/15/2021. With the adoption of the NYPD Disciplinary Matrix, CCRB now issues a Board Discipline Recommendation for officers that is separate and apart from the disposition of the allegations substantiated against the officer.

CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Investigator: J. Butler	Team: Squad #5	CCRB Case #: 201502719	<input type="checkbox"/> Force	<input type="checkbox"/> Discourt.	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S.
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Abuse	<input type="checkbox"/> O.L.	<input type="checkbox"/> Injury
Incident Date(s) Thu, 04/09/2015 8:05 PM	Location of Incident: Hinsdale Street and Riverdale Avenue	Precinct: 75	18 Mo. SOL 10/09/2016	EO SOL 10/9/2016	
Date/Time CV Reported Fri, 04/10/2015 1:23 PM	CV Reported At: CCRB	How CV Reported: Phone	Date/Time Received at CCRB Fri, 04/10/2015 1:23 PM		

Complainant/Victim	Type	Home Address
1. L. L.	Comp/Victim	Brooklyn NY 11236

Witness(es)	Home Address
1. S. G.	Brooklyn NY 11236

Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command
1. POM A. M.			PBBN
2. POM Sean Keegan	12338	954994	PBBN

Officer(s)	Allegation	Investigator Recommendation
A . POM A. M.	Abuse of Authority: PO A. M. stopped the car in which L. L. was an occupant.	A . Exonerated
B . POM Sean Keegan	Abuse of Authority: PO Sean Keegan stopped the car in which L. L. was an occupant.	B . Exonerated
C . POM A. M.	Abuse of Authority: PO A. M. questioned L.	C . Unsubstantiated
D . POM A. M.	Abuse of Authority: PO A. M. refused to provide his name to L. L.	D . Unsubstantiated
E . POM A. M.	Abuse of Authority: PO A. M. threatened to arrest L. L.	E . Unsubstantiated
F . POM A. M.	Abuse of Authority: PO A. M. searched the car in which L. L. was an occupant.	F . Unsubstantiated
G . POM Sean Keegan	Other: PO Sean Keegan failed to prepare a memo book entry as required by P.G. Procedure 212-08.	G . Other Misconduct

Case Summary

L [REDACTED] I [REDACTED] filed this complaint with the CCRB via phone on April 10, 2015.

On April 9, 2015, at approximately 8:05 p.m., PO A [REDACTED] M [REDACTED] and PO Sean Keegan of Patrol Borough Brooklyn North stopped Mr. I [REDACTED] as he was driving with his sixteen year old son, S [REDACTED] G [REDACTED] his nine year old son, and his seven year old son, at Hinsdale Street and Riverdale Avenue in Brooklyn (**Allegation A and Allegation B**). While Mr. I [REDACTED] attempted to locate his identification in the center console of his vehicle, PO M [REDACTED] allegedly asked Mr. I [REDACTED] if he had marijuana in the vehicle (**Allegation C**). Mr. I [REDACTED] requested PO M [REDACTED] name and shield number, and PO M [REDACTED] allegedly refused to provide his name (**Allegation D**). However, Mr. I [REDACTED] obtained PO M [REDACTED] shield number by reading it from his shield during the incident. As Mr. I [REDACTED] continued to search for his identification, PO M [REDACTED] allegedly asked Mr. I [REDACTED] if he wanted to be arrested in front of his children (**Allegation E**). PO M [REDACTED] then allegedly opened Mr. I [REDACTED] car door and reached his hand into the side compartment of the door to retrieve a small bottle of vodka (**Allegation F**). PO M [REDACTED] issued Mr. I [REDACTED] a summons for driving with an open container of alcohol, and when he provided the summons to Mr. I [REDACTED] he again allegedly refused to provide his name to Mr. I [REDACTED] (**Subsumed within Allegation D**) (Board Review 01 and 02).

Mr. G [REDACTED] was in the passenger's seat of the vehicle during the stop, and he was interviewed on April 13, 2015.

Mediation, Civil, and Criminal Histories

[REDACTED]

Civilian and Officer CCRB Histories

- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- PO Keegan has been a member of the NYPD for one year and has been the subject of three prior CCRB complaints involving six allegations, none of which were substantiated. There is no pattern in PO Keegan's CCRB history applicable to this case (See officer history).

Findings and Recommendations

Allegation A – PO A [REDACTED] M [REDACTED] stopped the car in which I [REDACTED] I [REDACTED] was an occupant.
Allegation B – PO Sean Keegan stopped the car in which I [REDACTED] I [REDACTED] was an occupant.

It is undisputed that PO M [REDACTED] and PO Keegan stopped Mr. I [REDACTED] as he was driving. It is also undisputed that Mr. I [REDACTED] windows were tinted (Board Review 01, 02, 04, and 05).

Mr. I [REDACTED] and Mr. G [REDACTED] stated that they came to a complete stop at a stop sign at the intersection of Hinsdale Street and Riverdale Avenue in Brooklyn (Board Review 01 and 02). Mr. I [REDACTED] sat in the driver's seat; Mr. G [REDACTED] sat in the front passenger's seat; and Mr. I [REDACTED] two younger sons sat in the back seats of the car (Board Review 01 and 02). After driving through the

intersection, PO M█████ and PO Keegan immediately pulled them over (Board Review 01, 02, 04, and 05). Mr. L█████ stated that all of his car windows were tinted to the maximum degree allowed by law, and Mr. G█████ confirmed that the car windows were tinted (Board Review 01 and 02).

PO M█████ stated that he observed Mr. L█████ drive through the intersection of Hinsdale Street and Riverdale Avenue without stopping at the stop sign (Board Review 04). PO Keegan did not recall seeing Mr. L█████ fail to stop at the stop sign, but he stated that PO M█████ informed him that Mr. L█████ failed to stop at the stop sign (Board Review 05). Both officers stated that they stopped Mr. L█████ due to the fact that he failed to stop at a stop sign and because his windows were tinted (Board Review 04 and 05). In addition, neither PO M█████ nor PO Keegan could clearly see into Mr. L█████ vehicle due to the heavy window tint (Board Review 04 and 05). PO M█████ issued Mr. L█████ a summons for driving with an open container of alcohol, but he did not issue Mr. L█████ summonses for failing to stop at a stop sign and driving with illegally tinted windows (Board Review 01, 02, and 04). PO M█████ stated that he used his discretion in issuing only one summons to Mr. L█████ because Mr. L█████ possessed a clean driving record, and PO Keegan stated that he did not know why PO M█████ issued Mr. L█████ only one summons (Board Review 04 and 05).

The police may stop an automobile when they have reasonable suspicion of criminal activity (Board Review 06).

The investigation determined by a preponderance of the evidence that PO M█████ and PO Keegan possessed reasonable suspicion to stop Mr. L█████. It is in dispute as to whether Mr. L█████ failed to stop at the stop sign, but it is undisputed that the windows of Mr. L█████ vehicle were tinted. By Mr. L█████ own admission, his windows were tinted to the maximum degree allowed by law, and both PO M█████ and PO Keegan had difficulty seeing into the car. As such, it was reasonable for the officers to stop Mr. L█████ on the suspicion that Mr. L█████ window tint exceeded the acceptable legal standard. Therefore, it is recommended that **Allegation A** and **Allegation B** be closed as **Exonerated**.

Allegation C – PO A█████ M█████ questioned L█████ L█████

It is undisputed that PO M█████ asked Mr. L█████ if marijuana was inside of his vehicle (Board Review 01, 02, 04, and 05).

Mr. L█████ and Mr. G█████ stated that PO M█████ asked Mr. L█████ if he had any marijuana in the car, and they both stated that there was no marijuana inside of the vehicle (Board Review 01 and 02).

PO M█████ stated that he smelled the odor of marijuana emanating from Mr. L█████ open car window, and he asked Mr. L█████ if there was any marijuana in the vehicle due to the presence of this odor (Board Review 04). PO Keegan did not recall whether Mr. L█████ vehicle smelled like marijuana, and he did not hear PO M█████ ask Mr. L█████ whether marijuana was in the vehicle (Board Review 05). PO Keegan also did not remember whether he asked Mr. L█████ if marijuana was in the vehicle (Board Review 05).

In the absence of independent corroboration as to whether Mr. L█████ vehicle smelled like marijuana, the investigation could not determine by the preponderance of the evidence whether PO M█████ question about the presence of marijuana in the vehicle was justified. Therefore, it is recommended that **Allegation C** be closed as **Unsubstantiated**.

Allegation D – PO A█████ M█████ refused to provide his name to L█████ L█████

It is undisputed that Mr. L█████ requested PO M█████ name and shield number (Board Review 01, 02, 04, and 05).

Mr. L [REDACTED] stated that he asked PO M [REDACTED] for his name and shield number when PO M [REDACTED] initially approached his car (Board Review 01). Mr. L [REDACTED] stated that PO M [REDACTED] did not respond to this request and instead asked Mr. L [REDACTED] to provide his license and registration (Board Review 01). Mr. G [REDACTED] confirmed that Mr. L [REDACTED] requested PO M [REDACTED] name and shield number when PO M [REDACTED] initially approached the car (Board Review 02). However, Mr. G [REDACTED] did not recall how Mr. L [REDACTED] requested this information, and he did not recall how PO M [REDACTED] responded to this initial request (Board Review 02). Mr. L [REDACTED] had difficulty reading PO M [REDACTED] shield number because PO M [REDACTED] was shining his flashlight into the car; however, Mr. L [REDACTED] was able to read and document PO M [REDACTED] shield number despite the shining light (Board Review 01). Mr. L [REDACTED] also requested PO M [REDACTED] name and shield number when PO M [REDACTED] issued his summons (Board Review 01). Mr. G [REDACTED] heard Mr. L [REDACTED] request PO M [REDACTED] name during this second interaction, but Mr. G [REDACTED] did not recall whether Mr. L [REDACTED] requested PO M [REDACTED] shield number at this time (Board Review 02). Both Mr. G [REDACTED] and Mr. L [REDACTED] stated that PO M [REDACTED] responded to the request by informing Mr. L [REDACTED] that his identifying information was on his summons (Board Review 01 and 02). However, PO M [REDACTED] name was illegible on the summons (Board Review 01 and 02).

PO M [REDACTED] stated that Mr. L [REDACTED] requested his name and shield number when he initially approached the car, and he stated that he provided this information to Mr. L [REDACTED] verbally (Board Review 04). According to PO M [REDACTED] Mr. L [REDACTED] also requested his shield number when he issued the summons to Mr. L [REDACTED] and PO M [REDACTED] again provided this information verbally (Board Review 04). PO M [REDACTED] also informed Mr. L [REDACTED] that all of his identifying information was listed on the summons, and PO M [REDACTED] allowed Mr. L [REDACTED] to take a picture of his shield with his cell phone (Board Review 04). PO Keegan did witness any conversation between PO M [REDACTED] and Mr. L [REDACTED] concerning a request for PO M [REDACTED] name and shield (Board Review 05).

In the absence of independent corroboration, the investigation could not determine by a preponderance of the evidence whether PO M [REDACTED] provided his name to Mr. L [REDACTED]. Therefore, it is recommended that that **Allegation D** be closed as **Unsubstantiated**.

Allegation E – PO A [REDACTED] M [REDACTED] threatened to arrest L [REDACTED] L [REDACTED]

Mr. L [REDACTED] and Mr. G [REDACTED] alleged that PO M [REDACTED] asked Mr. L [REDACTED] if he wanted to be arrested in front of his children while Mr. L [REDACTED] searched for his license and registration in the center console of his car (Board Review 01 and 02).

PO M [REDACTED] denied that he threatened to arrest Mr. L [REDACTED] (Board Review 04). PO M [REDACTED] stated that he requested Mr. L [REDACTED] license and registration upon approaching the vehicle and that Mr. L [REDACTED] responded by saying, “I’m not giving you shit” (Board Review 04). PO M [REDACTED] repeated his request to which Mr. L [REDACTED] again said, “I’m not giving you shit” (Board Review 04). PO Keegan heard PO M [REDACTED] repeatedly request that Mr. L [REDACTED] provide his license and registration, but he could not hear how Mr. L [REDACTED] responded to these requests (Board Review 05). PO M [REDACTED] then explained to Mr. L [REDACTED] that he could be arrested for failing to provide his identification to which Mr. L [REDACTED] said, “Fine. Fuck you. Arrest me” (Board Review 04). PO Keegan heard PO M [REDACTED] provide this explanation to Mr. L [REDACTED] but he could not hear Mr. L [REDACTED] response (Board Review 05). PO Keegan never saw Mr. L [REDACTED] search for his license and registration in the vehicle (Board Review 05).

It is undisputed that PO M [REDACTED] made some statement about the possibility of Mr. L [REDACTED] arrest. However, the exact wording of this statement is in dispute, and the circumstances establishing the justification for such a statement are also in dispute. Due to this discrepancy, the investigation could not determine by a preponderance of the evidence whether PO M [REDACTED]

threatened to arrest Mr. L [REDACTED]. Therefore, it is recommended that **Allegation F** be closed as **Unsubstantiated**.

Allegation F – PO A [REDACTED] M [REDACTED] searched the car in which L [REDACTED] L [REDACTED] was an occupant.

It is undisputed that PO M [REDACTED] retrieved a bottle of vodka from the driver's side door of Mr. L [REDACTED] vehicle (Board Review 01, 02, 04, and 05).

Mr. L [REDACTED] that PO M [REDACTED] told him to step out of the car after threatening to arrest him, but Mr. L [REDACTED] refused to step out of the car (Board Review 01). Mr. L [REDACTED] and Mr. G [REDACTED] stated that PO M [REDACTED] then opened the driver's side door and again told Mr. L [REDACTED] to step out of the car (Board Review 01 and 02). Mr. L [REDACTED] still refused to step out of the car (Board Review 01 and 02). According to Mr. L [REDACTED] and Mr. G [REDACTED] PO M [REDACTED] then reached his hand into a side compartment of the door and retrieved a small bottle of vodka (Board Review 01 and 02).

PO M [REDACTED] denied opening Mr. L [REDACTED] car door during the incident (Board Review 04). PO M [REDACTED] stated that he told Mr. L [REDACTED] to provide his license and registration twice and that Mr. L [REDACTED] refused to provide this information (Board Review 04). PO Keegan heard PO M [REDACTED] repeatedly request that Mr. L [REDACTED] provide his license and registration, but he could not hear how Mr. L [REDACTED] responded because he stood on the opposite side of the vehicle (Board Review 05). PO M [REDACTED] then explained that Mr. L [REDACTED] could be arrested for failing to provide his identification (Board Review 04). In response, Mr. L [REDACTED] said, "Fine. Fuck you. Arrest me" (Board Review 04). PO M [REDACTED] instructed Mr. L [REDACTED] to exit the vehicle, and Mr. L [REDACTED] forcefully opened his car door (Board Review 04). PO Keegan did not see exactly how the car door was opened (Board Review 05). PO Keegan believed that Mr. L [REDACTED] opened the car door because he saw Mr. L [REDACTED] move swiftly towards the door immediately before the door swung open (Board Review 05). At this time, PO M [REDACTED] observed a small bottle of vodka in plain view on the inner car door handle, and he retrieved the bottle from the car (Board Review 04). PO M [REDACTED] stated that the bottle was not concealed in a compartment and that it was clearly visible when Mr. L [REDACTED] opened his car door (Board Review 04). PO Keegan did not see PO M [REDACTED] retrieve this bottle of vodka from the car (Board Review 05). When PO M [REDACTED] was writing Mr. L [REDACTED] summons, PO M [REDACTED] informed PO Keegan that he retrieved the bottle from the inner car door handle (Board Review 05). PO Keegan did not see PO M [REDACTED] search any compartment inside of Mr. L [REDACTED] car door, and he did not see PO M [REDACTED] enter Mr. L [REDACTED] vehicle at any time during the incident (Board Review 05).

It is undisputed that PO M [REDACTED] retrieved a bottle of vodka from Mr. L [REDACTED] car door; however, the investigation could not determine by a preponderance of the evidence whether PO M [REDACTED] opened the door himself and searched for the bottle in a side compartment of the door or whether he retrieved the bottle after observing it in plain view once Mr. L [REDACTED] opened the door. Therefore, it is recommended that **Allegation E** be closed as **Unsubstantiated**.

Allegation G – PO Sean Keegan failed to prepare a memo book entry as required by P.G. Procedure 212-08.

Because PO Keegan did not prepare a memo book entry as required by Patrol Guide Procedure 212-08, it is recommended that he be cited for **Other Misconduct** (Board Review 07, NYPD Document).

Team: _____

Investigator:	_____	_____	_____
	Signature	Print	Date

Supervisor:	_____	_____	_____
	Title/Signature	Print	Date

Reviewer:	_____	_____	_____
	Title/Signature	Print	Date

Reviewer:	_____	_____	_____
	Title/Signature	Print	Date